UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/622,404	07/18/2003	Tien Le Nguyen	AESN3011	4145

23488   7590   10/18/2007

GERALD B ROSENBERG
NEW TECH LAW
260 SHERIDAN AVENUE
SUITE 208
PALO ALTO, CA 94306-2009

EXAMINER
VO, LILIAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2195	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/18/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>30 July 2007</u>.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1 – 20, 22 – 27, 29 – 31 and 33 - 36</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1 – 20, 22 – 27, 29 – 31 and 33 - 36</u> is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1 – 20, 22 – 27, 29 – 31 and 33 - 36 are pending. Claims 21, 28 and 32 have been

cancelled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

3.   Claims 1 – 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kawata et al.

(US Pat. Publication 2002/0032777, hereinafter Kawata) in view of Primak et al. (US Pat.

Publication 2002/0010783, hereinafter Primak).

4.   Regarding **claim 1**, Kawata discloses a method of cooperatively loud-balancing a cluster

of server computer systems for servicing client requests issued from a plurality of client

computer systems, wherein said client computer systems are mutually independent in issuing

client requests to said cluster of server computer systems and wherein said cluster of server

computer systems interoperate with said plurality of client computer systems to establish a

cooperative load-balancing of said cluster of server computer systems (page 1, paragraph 3, page

2, paragraphs 38 - 40), said method comprising the steps of:

a) selecting, by a client computer system, a target server computer system from said

cluster of server computer systems to service a particular client request using available

accumulated selection basis data, wherein said available accumulated selection basis data is

accumulated from said cluster of server computer systems (page 1, paragraph 3: the client looks

at the load status for each server in the state management server and sends its service request to

the server with the lowest load);

b) evaluating said particular client request to responsively provide instance selection

basis data dynamically dependent on the configuration of said target server computer and said

particular client request (page 2, paragraphs 38 - 40); and

c) incorporating said instance selection basis data into said available accumulated

selection basis data to affect the subsequent selection of said target computer system with respect

to a subsequent instance of said particular client request (page 2, paragraphs 40 - 41).

Kawata did not disclose the target server evaluates the client request. Nevertheless,

Primak discloses the selected server evaluates the client's request (page 4, paragraph 40).

Therefore, it would be obvious for one of an ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention

was made, to incorporate Primak's teaching with Kawata's to have the selected server evaluates

its capability to determine whether it is suitable to handle a client's request.

5.   Regarding **claim 2**, as modified Kawata discloses the instance selection basis data

includes representation of a dynamically determined performance level of said target server

computer system and wherein said available accumulated selection basis data incorporates said

instance selection basis data with identifications of said target server computer and said

particular client request (Kawata: page 2, paragraphs 38 - 41).

6.   Regarding **claim 3**, as modified Kawata discloses the instance selection basis data

includes a representation of a policy evaluation of the particular client request relative to the

target server computer system (Kawata: abstract, page 1, paragraph 7).

7.   Regarding **claim 4**, as modified Kawata discloses the instance selection basis data

includes a load value and a selection weighting value, wherein the load value represents a

dynamically determined performance level of the target server computer system and the selection

weighting value represents a policy evaluation of the particular client request relative to the

target server computer system and wherein the available accumulated selection basis data

incorporates the instance selection basis data with identifications of the target server computer

and the particular client request (Kawata: page 2, paragraphs 38 – 41, page 1, paragraphs 6 – 7

and 10).

8.   Regarding **claim 5**, as modified Kawata discloses the step of selecting selects the target

server computer system based on predetermined selection criteria including the relative values of

the load value and the selection weighting value with respect to said particular client request as

recorded in the available accumulated selection basis data (Kawata: page 2, paragraphs 38 – 41,

page 1, paragraphs 6 – 7 and 10).

9.   Regarding **claim 6**, as modified Kawata discloses the instance selection basis data

provides for a rejection of the particular client request and wherein the step of selecting includes

selecting an alternate server computer system from the cluster of server computer systems on the

target server system to service the particular client request based the available accumulated

selection basis data (Primak: page 4, paragraph 40).

10.   Claims 7 – 19, 25 – 27 and 29 – 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Mangipudi et al. (US Pat. Application Publication 2004/0162901, hereinafter

Mangipudi) in view of Aman et al. (US 6,249,800, hereinafter Aman).

11.   Regarding **claim 7**, Mangipudi discloses a method of load-balancing a cluster of server

computer systems in the cooperative providing of a network service to host computers operating

mutually independent of one another, the method comprising the steps of:

a) selecting, independently by each of a plurality of host computers, server computers

within a computer cluster to which to issue respective service requests (page 2, paragraph 18,

page 4, paragraph 38, page 5, paragraph 44, fig. 2);

b) responding, by a corresponding one of the plurality of host computers, to the rejection

of a predetermined service request by selecting a different server computer to which to issue the

predetermined service request (page 6, paragraph 51, page 7, paragraph 62);

c) receiving, in regard to the respective service requests by the respective ones of the

plurality of host computers, load information from the respective server computers, wherein load

information is dynamically generated by respective server computers (pages 2 - 3, paragraph

18); and

d) evaluating, by each of the plurality of host computers, the respective load and weight

information received with respect to server computers of the computer cluster as a basis for a

subsequent performance of the step of selecting (pages 2 - 3, paragraph 18, 21, page 5, paragraph

44).

Mangipudi did not clearly disclose the use and retrieval of weight information from the

servers. Nevertheless, Aman discloses the use and retrieval of weight information from the

server (col. 14 lines 44 – 61 and col. 16 lines 36 - 52). Thus, it would have been obvious for one

of an ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to incorporate Aman's

teaching together with Mangipudi so that the information can be used in selecting an appropriate

server to provide a sufficient service.

12.   Regarding **claim 8**, as modified Mangipudi discloses the step of determining said weight

information by each of said server computers with respect to each service request received, said

weight information being determined from a predefined policy association between a received

service request and the identity of the one of said server computers that receives the service

request (Aman: col. 16 lines 36 - 52).

13.   Regarding **claim 9**, as modified Mangipudi discloses the step of distributing initial

information by said cluster of server computers of said host computers, said initial information

providing selection lists of said server computers to said host computers (Mangipudi: page 3,

paragraph 21).

14.   Regarding **claim 10**, as modified Mangipudi discloses the load information is

representative of a plurality of load factors including network loading and processor loading

(Mangipudi: page 3, paragraph 18, 21).

15.   Regarding **claim 11,** as modified Mangipudi discloses the load information is

representative of the processing of a current set of service requests including a plurality of

processor functions (Mangipudi: page 5, paragraph 44, page 6, paragraph 47, 50, 51).

16.   Regarding **claim 12,** as modified Mangipudi discloses the load information includes one

or more load values representing processing functions internal to a server computer (Mangipudi:

page 6, paragraph 51, page 7, paragraph 57).

17.   Regarding **claim 13,** Mangipudi discloses a server cluster operated to provide a load-

balanced network service, the server cluster comprising:

        a) a plurality of server computers individually responsive to service requests to perform

corresponding processing services, wherein said server computers are operative to initially

respond to said service requests to provide load values, wherein said load values represent the

current operating load of a respective server computer relative to a particular service request

(page 3, paragraph 21, 24, page 4, paragraph 38, page 5, paragraph 44, page 6, paragraph 47, 51,

55, 56 and page 7, paragraph 57); and

b) a host computer system operative to autonomously issue the service requests

respectively to the plurality of server computers, the host computer system further operative to

select a target server computer from the plurality of server computers to receive on instance of

the particular service request based on the load and weight values (page 2, paragraph 18, page 4,

paragraph 38, page 5, paragraph 44, fig. 2).

With respect to the step of a plurality of server computers individually responsive to

service requests to perform corresponding processing services, wherein the server computers are

operative to initially respond to said service requests to provide load values, Mangipudi discloses

"each request is serviced by transmitting a response from at least one servers to the client device

that transmitted the request. Each server in the group or cluster is capable of responding to

requests of other servers in the group to promote load sharing within the group" (page 5,

paragraph 44) and the intelligent agents deployed on each server monitor several server

attributes/parameters including the load information and report back to the policy engine at the

router for maintaining service level requirements for each class (page 5, paragraph 55).

Mangipudi did not clearly disclose the use and retrieval of weight information which represent

a policy-based priority level of a respective server computer relative to a particular service

request. Nevertheless, Aman discloses the use and retrieval of weight information which

represents a policy-based priority level of a respect server relative to a particular service request

(col. 14 lines 44 – 61 and col. 16 lines 36 - 52). Thus, it would have been obvious for one of an

ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to incorporate Aman's teaching

together with Mangipudi so that the information can be used in selecting an appropriate server to provide a sufficient service.

18.   Regarding **claim 14**, as modified Mangipudi discloses the host computer is operative to collect the load and weight values from the plurality of server computers in connection with the issuance of respective service requests to the server computers and the selection of the target server computer is based on the relative temporal age of the load and weight values (Mangipudi: page 2, paragraph 18, page 5, paragraph 44, page 6, paragraph 55).

19.   Regarding **claim 15**, as modified Mangipudi discloses each of the server computers include a policy data set store that provides for the storage of a distinct server configuration and the load and weight values are dynamically determined by the server computers in response to the service requests based on the distinct server configurations of the server computers (Mangipudi: page 4, paragraph 38, page 5, paragraph 44, page 7, paragraph 59, 60).

20.   Regarding **claim 16**, as modified Mangipudi discloses the distinct server configurations include the distinct identities of the server computers (Mangipudi: page 4, paragraph 38, page 6 – 7, paragraph 56).

21.   Regarding **claim 17**, as modified Mangipudi discloses the distinct server configurations include distinct policy data relative to the service requests, wherein the host computer system is operative to collect, relative to respective service requests, and provide attribute data to server

computers, and wherein the server computers evaluate the attribute data in conjunction with the

distinct policy data to determine the weight values (Mangipudi: page 4, paragraph 38, page 6,

paragraph 55, page 7, paragraph 60 – 62).

22.   Regarding **claim 18**, as modified Mangipudi discloses the plurality of sever computers

implement a security processing service, wherein the host computer system is operative to

selectively route network transported data through the server computers dependent on the service

requests as evaluated by the plurality of the server computers (Mangipudi: fig. 4, page 4,

paragraph 40, page 5, paragraph 44, 45).

23.   Regarding **claim 19**, as modified Mangipudi discloses the host computer is operative to

initiate respective data transfer transactions for each of the server requests, wherein the default

routing of each data transaction initially provides for the transfer of corresponding ones of the

service requests to respective ones of the plurality of server computers, and wherein the

respective ones of the server computers determine whether the subsequent routing of network

data within the respective data transfer transactions includes routing the network data within the

respective data transfer transactions through the server computers (Mangipudi: page 4, paragraph

38, 39, page 6, paragraph 51, page 7, paragraph 62, page 5, paragraph 44).

24.   **Claims 25 – 27 and 29** are rejected on the same ground as stated in claims 2 and 7 – 9

above.

25.   Regarding **claim 30**, as modified Mangipudi discloses the client requests are issued with

respect to client computer systems, wherein the particular client request includes attributes

descriptive of a particular client computer system that issued the particular client request, and

wherein the relative prioritization reflects the evaluation of the attributes with respect to the

particular server computer system (Mangipudi: page 4, paragraph 38, page 5, paragraph 44, page

6, paragraph 55).

26.   Claims 20, 22 – 24, 31 and 33 - 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Mangipudi et al. (US Pat. Application Publication 2004/0162901) in view of

Ballard (US 6,078,960) and further in view of Aman et al. (US 6,249,800).

27.   Regarding **claim 20**, Mangipudi discloses a computer system providing, in support of a

plurality of client computer systems, a network service through a scalable cluster of server

computer systems, the system comprising:

a) a plurality of server computers coupled to provide a defined service, wherein a server

computer of the plurality provides a response, including dynamically determined load

information, in acknowledgment of a predetermined service request issued to the server

computer system, the response selectively including nonacceptance of the predetermined service

request (page 4, paragraph 38, page 6, paragraph 51, page 7, paragraph 62).

Mangipudi did not clearly disclose the additional limitation as claimed. Nevertheless,

Ballard discloses the system comprising a plurality of client computers coupleable through a

network to the servers having an identification list of the server computer systems, the client

computer system being operative to autonomously select a first server computer system from the

identification list to which to issue the predetermined service request, wherein the client

computer system is reactive to the response, on indicated nonacceptance of the predetermined

service request, to autonomously select a second server computer system from the identification

list to which to issue the predetermined service request, and wherein the client computer system

is responsive to load information of the response in subsequently autonomously selecting the

first and second server computer systems (col. 1, lines 46 – 56, col. 2, lines 11 – 28, col. 6, lines

52 - 64). Aman discloses the use and retrieval of weight information from the server in selecting

a particular server relative to a particular service request (col. 14 lines 44 – 61 and col. 16 lines

36 - 52). Thus, it would have been obvious for one of an ordinary skill in the art, at the time the

invention was made, to incorporate Aman's teaching together with Mangipudi and Ballard's to

provide a more reliable and flexible technique for achieving load balancing of client demand

(Ballard: col. 1, lines 39 – 41).

28.   Regarding **claim 22**, as modified Mangipudi discloses the plurality of server computer

systems include respective policy engines and wherein the weight information reflects an

association between a server computer policy role and the predetermined service request

(Mangipudi: page 3, paragraph 21).

29.   Regarding **claim 23**, as modified Mangipudi discloses the predetermined service request

includes predetermined client process attribute information and wherein the respective policy

engines are responsive to the predetermined client process attribute information in determining

the server computer policy role relative to the predetermined service request (Mangipudi: page 4, paragraph 38, page 5, paragraph 44, page 6, paragraph 55).

30.   Regarding **claim 24**, as modified Mangipudi discloses the load information includes a value representing network and server processor performance (Mangipudi: page 4, paragraph 39, page 5, paragraph 47, 48, 50, 55).

31.   **Claim 31** is rejected on the same ground as stated in claim 20 above.

32.   Regarding **claim 33**, as modified Mangipudi discloses the step of selecting includes a step of aging the accumulated selection information (Ballard: fig. 4a, 4b and col. 2, lines 17 – 28).

33.   **Claim 34** is rejected on the same ground as stated in claim 7 above.

34.   Regarding **claim 35**, as modified Mangipudi discloses the host process is executed on a client computer system (Ballard: col. 1, lines 44 – 67).

35.   Regarding **claim 36**, as modified Mangipudi discloses the host process is executed on a gateway computer system couple through a communications network with a plurality of client computer systems (Mangipudi: figs. 2 and 3).

Response to Arguments

36.   Applicant's arguments filed 7/30/07 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive for the reasons set forth below.

37.   In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the

references (page 12 paragraph 5), the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be

established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the

claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found

either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of

ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir.

1988)and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the

motivation for the rejection is found in the knowledge generally available to one of

ordinary skill in the art.

38.   In response to applicant's argument that "…the references fail to teach or suggest how

they can be combined in any proper and meaningful way and, even if combined, fail to teach or

suggest all required aspects of the method of claim 1" (page 12 paragraph 5, page 13 last

paragraph, page 14 paragraph 1, page 16 paragraph 2), the test for obviousness is not whether the

features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary

reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the

references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have

suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

39.   Regarding applicant's remark that the references fail to teach or suggest "that any client accumulated 'selection basis data'" and that "claim 1 explicitly requires accumulation of 'selection basis data' by the client computer system through the incorporation of 'said instance selection basis data into said available accumulated selection basis data'" (page 15 last paragraph – page 16 1st paragraph, page 16 paragraph 2), the examiner disagrees. Again applicant is arguing a feature of the invention not specifically stated in the claim language, which is improper. Claim subject matter, not the specification, is the measure of invention. Limitations in the specification cannot be read into the claims for the purpose of avoiding the prior art. In re Self, 213 USPQ 1,5 (CCPA 1982); In re Priest, 199 USPQ 11,15 (CCPA 1978).

As with the first step of claim 1 (step a), it merely recites that a client computer system selecting a target server computer using available accumulated selection basis which is accumulated from the cluster of servers. The examiner has interpreted this limitation of the claim as the client is selecting a server using the accumulated selection basis from the cluster of servers. In other words, the client is just using the information and not performing the process of accumulating the information.

Then as with the last step of claim 1 (step c), it merely recites that the client is incorporating the instance selection basis data into said available accumulated selection basis to data to affect a subsequent selection of said target computer. Again, as the claim recited, the client is just using the information to combine with the instance selection basis data. Examiner

submitted that the limitations as recited in the claim do not require the limitations to read on

anything more than a client is using the available accumulated selection basis data.

Furthermore, the examiner has interpreted the claim language as broadly as possible. It is

also the examiner's position that applicant has not yet submitted claims drawn to limitations

which define the method and system of applicant's disclosed invention in a manner that

distinguishes over the prior art. Failure for applicant to significantly narrow definition/scope of

the claims implies the applicant intends broad interpretation be given to the claims. The

examiner thus maintains the previous rejections to applicant's claims with regard to the

combination of Kawata and Primak.

40.   In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of

applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the

cooperatively load balancing between clients and servers without requiring direct

communications between the clients or a third server to coordinate the load balancing, page 17

paragraph 1) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light

of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van

Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

41.   In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually (page 19 last

paragraph), one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the

rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208

USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.,* 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

42.   With respect to applicant's argument that no combination of Mangipudi and Aman teach

or suggest "the retrieval of any other information, i.e., 'weight information'...'weight

information ...dynamically generated...by said server...'" (page 20 paragraph 7, page 21

paragraph 2), the examiner disagrees. Aman discloses the use and retrieval of weight

information from the server (col. 14 lines 44- 61 and col. 16 lines 36 – 52).

43.   In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually (page 1 paragraph

6), one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections

are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA

1981); *In re Merck & Co.,* 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

44.   Regarding applicant's argument with respect to claim 25 (page 22 paragraph 5), the

examiner disagrees and responds to the remark above in refuting the argument.

45.   In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the

references (page 25 paragraph 2), the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be

established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the

claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found

either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of

ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir.

1988)and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the

motivation for the rejection is found in the reference (Ballard col. 1 lines 39 – 41),

46.   With respect to applicant's argument that "such a consideration of the server generated

instance selection information, including both load and weight information, is no where taught or

suggested by the cited references, either alone or in combination" (page 25 paragraph 3, page 24

paragraph 7), the examiner disagrees. Mangipudi discloses the server provides the load

information (page 4 paragraph 38, page 6 paragraph 51, page 7 paragraph 62). Aman discloses

the use and retrieval of weight information from the server in selecting a particular server

relative to the particular service request (col. 14 lines 44 – 61, col. 16 lines 36 – 52).

Conclusion

47.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

        A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lilian Vo whose telephone number is 571-272-3774. The examiner can normally be reached on Thursday 8am - 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on 571-272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Lilian Vo
Examiner
Art Unit 2195

lv
October 11, 2007

MENG-AI T. AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100